Case 2:16-cv-05139 CHUST DOCUMENT SHFILED 09/27/16 Page 1 of 12

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil do	cket sneet. (SEE INSTRUCT)	IONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	ITIO PORMAJ			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Derrick Pennington			DEFENDANTS Philadelphia Police Officers Lewis and Sanders			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Williams Cuker Berezofsky 1515 Market Street, Suite 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19102 215-557-0099			NOTE: IN LAND CO	of First Listed Defendant P (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF ENDEMNATION CASES, USE THOSE LAND INVOLVED.		
	CTION (No. 1) W. S. C.	Desig Posts Outled	II. CITIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place on "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaint (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)						
U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	(ot a Party)	Citizen of This State	FF DEF I Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)		2 Incorporated and P of Business In A	Another State	
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT					Courtes on the second	
CONTRACT	TOI		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers'	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION: Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detaince 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detaince - Conditions of Confinement	Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) □ 1 Original □ 2 Removed from Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Appellate Court 1 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 42 USC 1983 Daie for example in a formula of course.						
	Brief description of ca Excessive Force	use.				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint JURY DEMAND: Second or complaint JURY DEMAND: Second or complaint JURY DEMAND: Second or complaint JURY DEMAND: No.						
VHI. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER						
DATE 09/27/2016	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		0				
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DERRICK PENNINGTON : CIVIL ACTION

:

Plaintiff, : HONORABLE

:

v. : JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

٠

OFFICER LEWIS, Badge No. 1772,

OFFICER SANDERS, Badge No.

Unknown, : No.

c/o City of Philadelphia

Law Department :

1515 Arch Street, 14th Floor :

Philadelphia, PA 19102

:

Defendants.

COMPLAINT (CIVIL ACTION)

I. NATURE OF ACTION

Plaintiff brings this action for compensatory damages and other relief, pursuant to 42
U.S.C. § 1983. He alleges that defendant's violation of his rights, guaranteed by the
Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, caused
him severe harm and injuries.

II. PARTIES

 Plaintiff Derrick Pennington is a citizen of the United States, currently residing in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. At all material times hereto, he was within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

- 3. Defendant Officer Lewis was at all times material hereto a Police Officer for the Philadelphia Police Department and within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 4. Defendant Officer Sanders was at all times material hereto a Police Officer for the Philadelphia Police Department and within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

III. JURISDICTION

- 5. Defendants are "persons" as the term is used in 42 U.S.C. § 1983. At all times material hereto, defendants acted pursuant to, or under color of, state law.
- 6. This action to vindicate plaintiff's rights protected by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution is brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This Court has jurisdiction over this civil rights action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343, and supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

IV. <u>VENUE</u>

7. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

1391(a) in that the defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction within the Eastern

District of Pennsylvania and the events that give rise to this action occurred within the

Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

V. ALLEGATIONS OF MATERIAL FACT

- 8. On or about November 15, 2014, Pennington was in his car talking with an acquaintance near the 5600 block of Thompson Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Pennington had recently resolved a dispute he had with his uncle, which someone had reported to the Philadelphia Police Department.

- 10. Defendant Lewis sped to where Pennington was, drew his weapon, pulled Pennington from his car, and frisked him, without probable cause or reasonable suspicion to do so.
- 11. While frisking Pennington, Lewis refused Pennington's request to justify his intrusion on Pennington's constitutional rights.
- 12. Lewis ordered Pennington to sit and remain in his car.
- 13. Lewis asked Pennington if he knew anything about a fight, because one had been reported.
- 14. Pennington truthfully denied a fight had taken place.
- 15. Pennington's uncle approached and also informed Lewis there had been no fight.
- 16. Lewis demanded Pennington produce his identification, of which Pennington was not in possession.
- 17. Pennington orally and truthfully provided his name and birth date to Lewis.
- 18. Lewis demanded Pennington provide his social security number, which Pennington had not memorized and did not know, and therefore could not provide.
- 19. At or around this time, defendant Officer Sanders arrived in the area of the 5600 block of Thompson Street.
- 20. Lewis again demanded Pennington provide his social security number.
- 21. Because Pennington was still not able to do so, Lewis placed him in Sanders's vehicle.
- 22. While he sat in Sanders's vehicle, Pennington observed Lewis searching

 Pennington's vehicle, gaining access to the vehicle with the keys he had taken from

 Pennington.

- 23. Lewis returned to his vehicle, then called out to Sanders, falsely, that Pennington was a child rapist.
- 24. Sanders and Lewis then gave Pennington conflicting commands to put his hands on top of his head so that he could be searched and to put his hands behind his back so that he could be handcuffed.
- 25. As a consequence, Lewis, who was attempting to handcuff Pennington, put Pennington in a chokehold.
- 26. As a result, Pennington experienced physical and emotional pain and suffering, and temporarily could not breathe and was on the verge of losing consciousness.
- 27. Lewis then picked Pennington up, still in a chokehold, slammed him into the ground, and then hurled him backwards onto the front of another vehicle, causing Pennington to experience further physical and emotional pain and suffering.
- 28. Pennington fell to the ground, unable to breathe, where he was handcuffed.
- 29. Lewis picked Pennington up and bent over the hood of the car so his pockets could be emptied.
- 30. Lewis then began to strike and beat Pennington, causing severe physical and emotional pain and suffering.
- 31. Lewis later falsely justified his use of force, claiming to utilize just three de minimis closed-fist compliance blows necessitated due to attempted flight and resistance.
- 32. Defendants took Pennington's cell phone and wristwatch, and did not provide a property receipt for either.
- 33. Upon information and belief, defendants retained Pennington's cell phone and wristwatch for their own personal gain.

- 34. Defendants drove Pennington to the 19th District headquarters.
- 35. Pennington asked to go to the hospital, which was not done for over an hour while he was alternately mocked and ignored by defendants and other officers.
- 36. At the hospital, Pennington was diagnosed with severe injuries, including but not limited to a broken jaw.
- 37. While in jail, Pennington was limited to a liquid diet.
- 38. To cover up their unconstitutional conduct, to corroborate their fabricated justification for the use of force, and for unrelated to the interests of justice, defendants charged Pennington with felony escape and misdemeanor reckless endangerment, resisting arrest, and false identification to a law enforcement officer.
- 39. Each of the foregoing charges was based on the untruthful, fabricated statements of defendants.
- 40. Those charges where eventually withdrawn, after defendants did not show up to court.
- 41. Pennington tried to file a report with the Philadelphia Police Department's Internal Affairs Division but was threatened with facing the dismissed charges refiled against him.
- 42. While awaiting adjudication of those charges, Pennington experienced emotional distress, including emotional distress associated with the possibility of a term of imprisonment for the third-degree felony with which he was charged.
- 43. Defendants' conduct violated plaintiff's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and under Pennsylvania law.

- 44. As a result of the actions and/or omissions of defendants, plaintiff suffered significant damages and harms including:
 - a. A broken jaw, abrasions, and bruises, all with attendant and ongoing pain and suffering;
 - b. difficulty with eating
 - c. emotional distress;
 - d. deprivation of property;
 - e. interference with daily activities;
 - f. wage loss and loss of earning capacity;
 - g. some or all of which are ongoing/permanent.
- 45. Plaintiff's damages and harms were caused by the culpable conduct of defendants, as alleged in the foregoing paragraphs and hereinbelow.
- 46. The conduct of defendants was carried out in wanton and outrageous disregard for the Constitution and plaintiff's rights thereunder, and was motivated solely by self-interest, completely unrelated to the administration of justice or any legitimate purpose, thereby warranting an award of exemplary damages against them.

VI. CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT ONE 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Plaintiff v. All Defendants

47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the foregoing paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

- 48. As alleged more fully hereinabove, Pennington was subjected to excessive force, for no legitimate purpose, and which force was objectively unreasonable, by defendants.
- 49. In the alternative, to the extent that either defendant Lewis or Sanders did not make physical contact with Pennington's person, they each had reasonable opportunity to intervene and prevent further violation of Pennington's constitutional rights and, despite knowing that Pennington was and would be subjected to excessive force, failed to do so.
- 50. Defendants' conduct violated plaintiff's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution to be free from excessive force, unreasonable search and seizure, and deprivation of liberty without due process.
- 51. As a direct and proximate result of the violation of his constitutional rights, plaintiff suffered serious mental and physical harm.

COUNT II 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Conspiracy) Plaintiff v. All Defendants

- 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the foregoing paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 53. Defendants, acting within the scope of their employment as police officers and under color of state law, agreed between themselves and/or other individuals to act in concert to deprive plaintiff of clearly established Constitutional rights, as alleged hereinabove, and to obscure or otherwise prevent discovery of their culpable conduct.
- 54. In furtherance of the conspiracy, defendants engaged in and/or facilitated multiple overt acts, including but not limited to:

- a. fabricating an excuse to justify the use of force against Pennington where none existed;
- b. omitting additional incidents of their utilization of force against Pennington from their written narratives;
- c. providing false corroboration of each other's false statements and accounts;
- d. stealing and retaining property belonging to Pennington for their own gain and agreeing to omit reporting their seizure of Pennington's property.
- 55. As a result of defendants' conspiracy and acts in furtherance of it, plaintiff suffered the harms and damages alleged hereinabove.

COUNT III Malicious Prosecution (Pennsylvania Law) Plaintiff v. All Defendants

- 56. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the foregoing paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 57. Plaintiff suffered the harms and damages alleged hereinabove as a direct and proximate result of defendants' violation of his right under Pennsylvania law to be free from malicious prosecution.

VII. JURY DEMAND

58. Plaintiff demands a jury determination of all issues so triable.

VIII. PRAYER FOR RELEF

Wherefore, plaintiff asks the Court to enter judgment in his favor and against defendants, jointly, severally, and individually, and asks for the following relief:

a) general and compensatory damages;

- b) exemplary damages;
- c) attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;
- d) such interest as is allowed by law; and
- e) other such relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS CUKER BEREZOFSKY, LLC

Christopher Markos, Esquire

Pa. ID No. 308997

1515 Market Street, Suite 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19102-19129

Phone: 215.557.0099 Fax: 215.557.0673

Email: cmarkos@wcblegal.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: September 27, 2016

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Pennington

CIVIL ACTION

v.	о Д				
P/O Lewis & Sanders		NO.			
In accordance with the Civil Justice plaintiff shall complete a Case Manafiling the complaint and serve a copy side of this form.) In the event that designation, that defendant shall, with plaintiff and all other parties, a Case M that defendant believes the case should	gement Track Designa on all defendants. (Sec at a defendant does no atts first appearance, su lanagement Track Desi	tion Form in all civil cases at the tire \$ 1:03 of the plan set forth on the rest agree with the plaintiff regarding about to the clerk of court and serve or	ne of verse said on the		
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOW	ING CASE MANAG	EMENT TRACKS:			
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.					
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)					
(f) Standard Management - Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.					
Date At 215-557-0099 215-557		Attorney for Plaintiff cmarkos@wcblegal.com	<u>_</u>		
Telephone FA	AX Number	E-Mail Address			
(Civ. 660) 10/02					

Case 2:16-cv-05139-9HS-Document 1 Fried 09/27/16 Page 12 of 12

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA - DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of

assignment to appropriate calendar.			
Address of Plaintiff: 1231 Fraizer St, Philadelphia, PA 19131			
Address of Defendant: 1515 Arch Street, 14th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19102			
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Philadelphia, PA (Use Reverse Side For Accident)	Additional Connol		
`			
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a			
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)	Yes□ No		
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No ∑		
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Data Transferred		
Case Number:	Date Terminated:		
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:			
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one y			
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior	Yes No No		
action in this court?	surf pending of within one year previously terminated		
	Yes□ No No		
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes□ No Y		
terminated action in this court?	163— 110—		
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	ts case filed by the same individual?		
	Yes□ No Ø		
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)			
	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:		
 A. Federal Question Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts		
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury		
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation		
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury		
5. □ Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury		
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)		
7. X Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability		
8. Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos		
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases		
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)		
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases			
(Please specify)			
ARBITRATION CERT	TIFICATION		
(Check Appropriate C	'ategory)		
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and			
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	bellet, the damages recoverable in this even action case exceed the same of		
□ Relief other than monetary damages is sought			
DATE: 09/27/18 // //	308947		
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#		
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	ere has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.		
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court		
except as noted above.			
DATE: 01/27/16	308997		
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#		

CIV. 609 (5/2012)